REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, the Abstract for the above application has been amended three times of which the latest Abstract revision is presented in the Amendment submitted 26 May 2006 under 37 CFR 1.116. Accordingly, the patent which issues on this application should be printed with the Abstract as revised in the 26 May 2006 Amendment.

The introductory heading for the claims has been changed from "CLAIMS:" to the grammatically correct phrase "We claim:".

The dependency of Claim 52 has been corrected so it depends from Claim 51 rather than Claim 41. No other changes have been made to the claims. Consequently, all of allowed Claims 41 - 60, 62 - 82, 84, 86, 89, and 92 continue to be pending.

As to the claim dependency change, Claim 51 introduces "audio messages" with the recitation that the stream demultiplexer also operates "to provide, for use by the control unit, audio messages which deal with the audio timing information". Claim 52 then recites that "the audio messages also indicate where the encoded audio data is stored in the audio input buffer". Inasmuch as independent Claim 41 does not recite any "audio messages", Claim 52 properly depends from Claim 51 and has been so corrected here.

Entry of the present amendment will not entail materially added work on the Examiner's part. No more than a cursory review of the record will be needed. Accordingly, this amendment should be entered.

Additionally, the Amendment submitted 27 July 2005 inadvertently contained an earlier version of page 15 bearing hand annotations indicating changes made to page 15. Enclosed is a corrected version of page 15 as it was intended to be incorporated into the 27 July 2005 Amendment. Please place the corrected version of page 15 in the PTO file for the above application.

Ronald J. Meetin
Attorney at Law
210 Central Avenue
Mountain View, CA
94043-4869
Tel.: 650-964-9767
Fax: 650-964-9779

Please telephone Attorney for Applicant(s) at 650-964-9767 if there are any questions.

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.: **EV 743 585 493 US**	Respectfully submitted, *Ronald J. Meetin* Ronald J. Meetin Attorney for Applicant(s) Reg. No. 29,089 210 Central Avenue Mountain View, CA 94043-4869

Ronald J. Meetin
Attorney at Law
210 Central Avenue
Mountain View, CA
94043-4869

Tel.: 650-964-9767
Fax: 650-964-9779

CORRECTED PAGE 15
OF AMENDMENT SUBMITTED 27 JULY 2005
FOR U.S. PATENT APPLICATION 09/301,438,
FILED 28 APRIL 1999,
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. NS-3799 US

Nothing in the preceding portions of Okada discloses or suggests that Okada's audio or video controller is capable of being interrupted during the performance of one task in order to perform another task.

Nor does anything else in Okada disclose or suggest that its audio or video controller is capable of being interrupted during the performance of one task in order to perform another task. Since each of Claims 41 and 67 now requires that the control unit be "capable of being interrupted during at least one of the tasks to perform at least one other of the tasks", combining Okada and Maturi in the proposed way would <u>not</u> achieve the subject matter of Claim 41 or 67 <u>even if</u> there were some motivation or incentive for combining the two references. This is true regardless of whether the Examiner's references to Okada's "controller" or "control unit" mean audio controller 14, video controller 24 (or 42 or 83), or both audio controller 14 and video controller 24 (or 42 or 83). Accordingly, Claims 41 and 67 are patentable over Okada and Maturi.

Claims 42 - 52, 55 - 60, and 62 - 66 all depend from (directly or indirectly) from Claim 41. The same applies to new Claims 83 and 84. Claims 68 - 75 and 78 - 82, along with new Claims 85 and 86, all depend (directly or indirectly) from Claim 67. Hence, dependent Claims 42 - 52, 55 - 60, 62 - 66, 68 - 75, and 78 - 86 are patentable over Okada and Maturi for the same reasons as independent Claims 41 and 67.

Dependent structure Claim 42 recites that "the control unit is interrupted in response to a synchronization signal for reading the video messages provided by the system demultiplexer and for providing the video instructions to the video decoder". Dependent structure Claim 59 similarly recites that, "in response to a synchronization signal generated by the video output processor, the control unit is interrupted for reading the video messages provided by the stream demultiplexer and for providing the video instructions to the video decoder".

Dependent method Claim 68 recites that the method further includes "generating a synchronization signal" and "interrupting the control unit in response to the synchronization signal for causing the control unit to read the video messages and to generate the video instructions". Dependent method Claim 79 similarly recites that the method further includes "utilizing a video output processor that processes the decoded video data to generate a